Appl. No. 09/841,965
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to FINAL Office action of 19 April 2005

Page 4 of 10

REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1 and 3-7 are pending in the application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the acceptability of the drawings.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Peterka International Publication WO99/66714 ("Peterka").

Applicants respectfully traverse those rejections for at least the following reasons.

<u>Claim 1</u>

Among other things, in the network of claim 1 the filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object, monitors a change in the access rights, and triggers withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object.

Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka disclose no such features.

The Office Action now states that Peterka supposedly discloses the following features in the following text: *"the filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object"* (citing page 20, line 28 – page 21; page 31, lines 19-28); *"the filter monitors a change in the access rights"* (citing page 21, lines 11-20 and page 21, line 21 – page 22, line 14; and page 31, lines 19-28); and *"the filter triggers withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object"* (citing page 22, lines 22-33 and FIG. 3, ref 370).

Applicants respectfully disagree, and respectfully submit that none of the text cited above discloses any of these features.

I. <u>The filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object</u>

The filter of claim 1 evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object. For one example, as disclosed in

Appl. No. 09/841,965   Page 5 of 10
Amendment and/or Response   .
Reply to FINAL Office action of 19 April 2005

Applicants specification at page 3, lines 24-26, while a user (e.g., a child) is accessing a television program, the filter may continue to evaluate the total time that the user has accessed the television set.

Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka does not disclose any such feature. In particular, Peterka does not disclose such a feature in the cited text at page 20, line 28 – page 21, or page 31, lines 19-28. The cited text at page 20, line 28 – page 21 pertains to determining whether a condition is satisfied **before** the user has access to the access control object. In that regard, reference is made to FIG. 3, steps 380 and 390 which clearly show that the condition is checked before access is allowed, and to the claims, e.g., claim 1 steps (e)(i) and (e)(ii). That is, in the cited text of Peterka, although the user has the required permission, the user does not yet have **access** to the access control object. The Office Action does not cite anything in Peterka that indicates that a user already has access to the access control object when the check is made as discussed at page 20, line 28 – page 21. Similarly, the cited text at page 31, lines 19-28 states that when a user attempts to access another access control object, the access may be denied. The text does not state or imply that any filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has already gained access to the channel.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka does not disclose that any filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object.

II. The filter monitors a change in the access rights

The filter of claim 1 monitors a change in the access rights while the user has access to the access control object. For one example, as disclosed in Applicants specification at page 3, lines 24-26, while a user (e.g., a child) is accessing a television program, the total time that the user has accessed the television set may exceed the maximum allowable time such that the access rights are changed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka does not disclose any such feature. In particular, Peterka does not disclose such features in the cited text at

Appl. No. 09/841,965
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to FINAL Office action of 19 April 2005

Page 6 of 10

page 21, lines 11-20 or page 21, line 21 – page 22, line 14. The cited text at page 21, lines 11-20 discusses changes in the current environment **before** the user has access to the access control object. That is, in the cited text of Peterka, although the user has the required permission, the user does not yet have **access** to the access control object. The Office Action does not cite anything in Peterka that indicates that a user already has access to the access control object when the current environment is evaluated as discussed at page 21, lines 11-20. Meanwhile, the cited text at page 21, line 21 – page 22, line 14 discusses conditions generally, but does not indicate that any filter monitors a change in the access rights while the user has access to an access control object. Finally, the cited text at page 31, lines 19-28 states that when a user attempts to access another channel (access control object), the access may be denied. The text does not state or imply that any filter monitors a change in the access rights occurring while the user has already gained access to the channel.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka does not disclose that any filter monitors a change in the access rights while the user has access to the access control object.

III. The filter triggers withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object

The filter of claim 1 triggers withdrawal of the access rights to an access control object to which a user already has access. For one example, as disclosed in Applicants specification at page 3, lines 24-26, while a user (e.g., a child) is accessing a television program, and then the maximum allowable time for using the television set elapses, the filter causes the access rights to be withdrawn. Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka does not disclose any such feature. In particular, Peterka does not disclose such features in the cited text at page 22, lines 22-23. Indeed, in contrast, the cited text at page 22, lines 22-23 indicates that a condition is checked **before** a requested receiver function is allowed. Thus, at page 22 lines 29-31 the text states that if the condition is not satisfied, the call fails and the **original request to invoke the receiver function is denied**. Nowhere does the cited text suggest that if the original request if granted, a filter may later trigger

Atty. Docket No. **DE-000071**

Appl. No. 09/841,965
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to FINAL Office action of 19 April 2005

Page 7 of 10

withdrawal of the access rights. Meanwhile, the Office Action cites FIG. 3, element 370 as supposedly disclosing a step of triggering withdrawal of the access rights to an access control object to which a user already has access. However, inspection of FIG. 3 of Peterka shows that the user does not yet have access to the access control object at step 370, and that access is only granted at step 390. Therefore, it is not possible to trigger a withdrawal in step 370 of rights that are not even granted until step 390!

Indeed, Applicants respectfully submit that nowhere in FIG. 3 is there any disclosure or mention of evaluating additional data occurring while the user has access to an access control object, monitoring a change in the access rights, and triggering withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object. Inspection of FIG. 3 shows the once a function call is made (330), and the condition is met (380), the function is allowed (390) and that is the end of the process. There is nothing in FIG. 3 which discloses that access rights are ever dynamically withdrawn during an access which has already been granted. Meanwhile, Peterka specifically discloses that his invention "evaluates the current conditions . . . before granting permission," (page 33, lines 5-9) but does not state that conditions are further evaluated while access is in progress.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka does not disclose that any filter triggers withdrawal of the access rights to an access control object to which a user already has access.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Peterka.

Claims 3-4

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and are deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 5

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is patentable over Peterka in view of brown et al. U.S. Patent 5,941,947 ("Brown") for at least the following reasons.

Among other things, in the network of claim 5 an access rights manager has a

Appl. No. 09/841,965
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to FINAL Office action of 19 April 2005

Page 8 of 10

data structure in the form of a tree for arranging the access controlled objects, wherein the tree includes a plurality of nodes which each contain a list of permitted users or user groups respectively, of an access controlled object and for each user or user group respectively, include a list of methods of use.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither <u>Peterka</u> nor <u>Brown</u> nor any possible combination thereof includes such features.

The Office Action cites <u>Brown</u> col. 2, lines 38-46 as supposedly disclosing such features.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

The cited text in <u>Brown</u> merely discloses that a directory service maintains a directory of content objects as nodes in a tree-like structure. However, the cited text makes no mention of each node containing a list of permitted users or user groups, respectively, of the access controlled object and for each user or user group respectively, including a list of methods of use. Indeed, Applicants see no such disclosure anywhere in <u>Brown</u>. Instead, it appears that <u>Brown</u> uses an access control matrix and access rights database (152) which is **organized by users, not by objects**, and which is organized on a user-by-user (or user-group-by-user-group) basis to list for each user (or user group) the content nodes and access operations available to the <u>user</u> (<u>see, e.g.</u>, col. 16, lines 39-45 and FIG. 6).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that no combination of <u>Peterka</u> and <u>Brown</u> would ever produce the network of claim 5.

The Final Office Action has failed to explain how one could possibly modify <u>Peterka</u> to include <u>Brown</u>'s access control matrix and access rights database which is a **tree for arranging users**, wherein the tree includes a plurality of nodes which each **contain a list of the content and access operations available to the user**, and in the resulting combination come up with a network that includes an access right manager that has a data structure in the form of a **tree for arranging access controlled objects**, wherein the tree includes a plurality of nodes which each **contain a list of permitted users or user groups respectively**, of the access controlled object **and for each user or user group respectively, include a list of**

Appl. No. 09/841,965
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to FINAL Office action of 19 April 2005

Page 9 of 10

methods of use, as in claim 5 Indeed, no mention of the recited list of methods of use is even made in the Office Action!

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is patentable over Peterka and Brown.

Claim 6

Claim 6 depends from claim 5 and is deemed patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 5, and for the following additional reasons.

Among other things, in the network of claim 6, the filter further evaluates additional data occurring while the user has access to the access control object, monitors a change in the access rights, and triggers withdrawal of the access rights to the access controlled object.

As explained above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Peterka discloses no such features.

Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim 7

Among other things, the network of claim 7 includes a software system adapted to reserve use of a first one of the access control objects by a user via one of the terminals, wherein the software system further comprises a filter adapted to continuously monitor dynamic data affecting access rights to the first control object and, in response to the dynamic data, to generate a message indicating withdrawal of the access rights of the user to the first access control object, the software system being adapted to release the reservation of the first access control object in response to the message from the filter.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not disclose any network that continuously monitors dynamic data affecting access rights to an access control object, in response to the dynamic data generates a message indicating withdrawal of the access rights of the user to the access control object, and releases the reservation of the first access control object in response to the

Appl. No. 09/841,965
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to FINAL Office action of 19 April 2005

Page 10 of 10

message.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable over the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing explanations, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and reexamine the present application, allow claims 1 and 3-7 and pass the application to issue. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact Kenneth D. Springer (Reg. No. 39,843) at (703) 715-0870 to discuss these matters.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment (except for the issue fee) to Deposit Account No. 50-0238 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, P.L.L.C.

Date: 17 May 2005

By: _____
Kenneth D. Springer
Registration No. 39,843

VOLENTINE FRANCOS & WHITT, P.L.L.C.
One Freedom Square
11951 Freedom Drive, Suite 1260
Reston, Virginia 20190
Telephone No.: (703) 715-0870
Facsimile No.: (703) 715-0877

Atty. Docket No. **DE-000071**